

Bad Bronze Again

Thomson, George

DOI:

[10.1017/S0009840X00094701](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009840X00094701)

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Thomson, G 1949, 'Bad Bronze Again', *The Classical Review*, vol. 63, no. 02, pp. 49.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009840X00094701>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

© Cambridge University Press

Eligibility for repository checked October 2014

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Bad Bronze Again

George Thomson

The Classical Review / Volume 63 / Issue 02 / September 1949, pp 49 - 49

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00094701, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00094701

How to cite this article:

George Thomson (1949). Bad Bronze Again. The Classical Review, 63, pp 49-49

doi:10.1017/S0009840X00094701

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

NAEVIUS AND THE *ALIMONIUM REMI ET ROMULI*

DONATUS, *ad Ter. Ad.* 537, after offering two explanations of the phrase *lupus in fabula*, adds 'nam falsum est quod dicitur interuenisse lupum Naeuianae fabulae alimonio Remi et Romuli, dum in theatro agitur'. Does this mean that Naeuius wrote a separate praetexta dealing with the infancy of Romulus, or was this the same praetexta as that entitled *Romulus* which is mentioned by Varro (*L.L.* vii. 54)? It seems to me that neither of these alternatives should be adopted. Donatus is merely refuting an absurd theory (which one almost suspects him of inventing). Since *fabula* can mean 'play' as well as 'story', 'fable', the phrase *lupus in fabula* could

be taken to have originally meant 'the wolf in the play'. The question would then arise—what was the play in which a wolf might be supposed to have appeared? The mention of a wolf might suggest the infancy of Romulus, and Naeuius had written a praetexta dealing with Romulus. But to explain the phrase in this way would, as Donatus very rightly says, be false. The only value of the passage is to confirm indirectly the statement of Varro that there was a play of Naeuius which had Romulus as its hero.

W. BEARE.

University of Bristol.

BAD BRONZE AGAIN

IN C.R. lix. 52 Mr. D. E. Eichholz and Professor T. A. Sinclair have criticized my interpretation of Aesch. *Ag.* 390–3 *κακοῦ δὲ χαλκοῦ τρόπον τρίβω τε καὶ προσβολαῖς μελαμπαγῆς πέλει δικαιοθεῖς* (C.R. lviii. 35), the former on the ground that it is technically impossible. I deferred my reply in order to obtain expert advice, and now offer the following comments after consulting a Greek goldsmith.

Mr. Eichholz wrote: 'It was not the touchstone which marked the gold, but on the contrary the gold which marked the touchstone.' That is true, so far as the lydian stone is concerned. There was a confusion in my note on this point, and I am grateful for the correction.

But how does he translate Theogn. 449–50 *εὐρήσεις δέ με πᾶσιν ἐπ' ἔργμασιν ὥσπερ ἀπεφθον χρυσόν, ἐρυθρόν ἰδεῖν τριβόμενον βασάνῳ*? The last four words must surely mean 'red to look at when rubbed with the touchstone'. Here it is the mark left by the stone on the gold that is inspected, not the mark left by the gold on the stone.

The colour of impure gold varies according to the alloy. Mixed with copper, it is reddish; with silver, whitish; with nickel, greenish. When the lydian stone is used, the colour of the metal proper, as distinct from any dirt with which it may be encrusted, appears as a thin streak adhering to the stone, which being black throws it into relief. This method has the additional advantage that the stone can be marked previously with a streak of pure gold to serve as a standard of comparison. But the true colour of the metal will also appear on the metal itself if it is rubbed with any object hard enough to remove superficial dirt. This is only a rough-and-ready test, but quite practicable, and I suggest that this is what both Theognis and Aeschylus had in mind.

The colour of impure gold is not necessarily darker than that of pure gold; it is simply different. Therefore the idea of *μελαμπαγῆς* is not taken from

gold-assaying. Professor Sinclair explains it as follows: 'If bronze or copper or brass is bad, polishing and hammering will reveal impure streaks of black.' This is technically correct, but it involves three difficulties. It is doubtful whether *προσβολαῖς* can mean 'hammering'; the idea of bad bronze as a symbol of unrighteousness is without parallel in Greek poetry; and, as he admits, *μελαμπαγῆς* is left without point in relation to the *man*.

It seems that my interpretation is the only one that does justice to *μελαμπαγῆς*.

GEORGE THOMSON.

University of Birmingham.

TWO NOTES ON EURIPIDES

Cyclops 402–4

καὶ †καθαρχάσας†

λάβρω μάχαιρα σάρκας ἐξώπτα πυρί,
τὰ δ' ἐς λέβητ' ἐφῆκεν ἐψεσθαί μέλη.

I suggest keeping *καθαρχάσας* and reading *μάχαιραν*. It seems not essential for Euripides to specify the cutting up. For the corruption cf. 394 *κλάδω* LP for *κλάδων* Scaliger, *Rhes.* 126, *Ar. Ach.* 23 *ἀωρία* Suid. for *ἀωρίαν* codd. et Phryn.: conversely, *Hel.* 981 *θηρᾶν* LP for *θηρᾶ* Canter, *Or.* 1187, *Phoen.* 166, *I.A.* 567, *Soph. Tr.* 831, *Ar. Av.* 1620 *μοσητίαν* vulg. for *μοσητία* Suid. *λάβρω* now goes with *πυρί*: cf. *Or.* 697. Is *λάβρος* anywhere applied to a weapon? For *καθαρχάσας μάχαιραν* cf. *Andr.* 1122, *Eur. El.* 819.

I.T. 753–4

Πν. ἀκουε δὴ νυν ὃν παρήλθομεν λόγον.

Ιφ. ἀλλ' αὐθὺς ἔσται καινός, ἣν καλῶς ἔχη.

I propose *ἀλλ' εὐθὺς ἔστω καινός* (*καινός* Markland). For *καινός* cf. *Hippol.* 609, *Tro.* 53–4, *Or.* 1098, *I.A.* 44: *εὐθὺς*, *αὐθὺς* are variants at *Ar. Av.* 377: apogr. Paris. gives *ἔστω* for *ἔσται* at *Eur. Supp.* 1191: for the sentiment cf. *Tro.* 717–18.

E. L. B. MEURIG DAVIES.